

Meeting Record

MPO Technical Committee Meeting
Tuesday, February 22, 2002
City/County Building, Room 113
Lincoln, Nebraska

MEMBERS AND OTHERS A. Abbott, K. Morgan (representing K. Sellman), R. Figard, M. Wullschleger, R. Schlautman (representing A. Yonkey), D. Thomas, R. Peters, R. Ruby, R. Hoskins (representing V. Singh), L. Wunderlich (representing Eldon Poppe), C. Riley (representing R. Thorson), L. Worth

IN ATTENDANCE:

OTHERS: David Schoenmaker (NDOR), S. Burham, J. Snowdon, (FHWA), Mike Brienzo, Duncan Ross (Planning), Brian Praeuner (StarTran), Mike Carlin (the public), Phyllis Hergenrader (the public), Roger Ohlrich and Karen Sieckmeyer (Public Works/Utilities)

**STATED PURPOSE
OF THE MEETING:** Technical Committee Meeting

Before the meeting started, Allan Abbott introduced the new City Traffic Engineer, Randy Hoskins.

Allan Abbott called the meeting to order.

A request has been received from the Lower Platte South NRD to amend our agenda with a TIP amendment. A motion was made by Ron Schlautman to revise the agenda to include this amendment by the Lower Platte South NRD, seconded by Roger Figard. Motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item No. 1 - Review and action on the draft minutes of the December 4, 2001 Technical Committee Meeting

Roger Figard moved to approve the December 4, 2002 minutes, seconded by Morgan. Motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item No. 2 - Review and action on the proposed Year 2025 City of Lincoln and Lancaster County Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

Mike Brienzo introduced himself and informed the committee that they were being asked to review and act upon the Long Range Transportation Plan. Comments and recommendations would be received and forwarded to the Planning Commission. There are two parts to the Long Range Transportation Plan, the existing documentation and the future transportation conditions.

In order to maintain some order, Allan suggested that we go through the existing description which goes from page E51 through E64. Allan asked for any comments or concerns for the existing section.

Ron Schlautman had a concern on page E55 - Truck Route Study. Ron feels the two statements in the existing and future documentation do not match. The existing says “ *the South and East Beltway are now being planned and funding programed*”. Ron feels that statement is more aggressive than the statement “*we are going to continue to plan*”. Discussion was held and Allan said the word *programed* could mean four different things. It was suggested that the word *programed* be replaced with the word *determined*. There being no other comments or recommendations, a motion was made by Kent Morgan to accept the existing section from Pages E51 through E64 as written with the change in wording on page E55 from *programed* to *determined* seconded by Figard. Motion carried unanimously.

Transportation Planning Principles Section on page F87 through F90 was unanimously approved with no comments or recommendations.

Transportation Planning Requirements on page F91 was unanimously approved with no comments or recommendations.

Pedestrians on page F91 through F94. Mike Brienzo briefly high lighted the pedestrian section. John Snowden wanted to compliment them on developing the pedestrian standards but was interested in who would be developing those standards? Allan said it would be a joint effort between Planning, Public Works, Parks and Urban Development to develop the standards. David Schoenmaker had a comment on the middle of page 93 where it says *...reduce the number and length of automobile trips, conserve energy, and for the convenience/health of the residence*. David would like to see this included to encourage walking - somehow acknowledging health. Roger had a question - he understands that this document, as it is written, is the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan Committee. If we suggest, minor/major changes, how will that be sent onto the Planning Commission. Allan explained that at the end of this meeting, we will pass a resolution stating that these are the recommendations of the Technical Committee to be accepted with these changes. Roger stated that you can't change the Comprehensive Plan Committee's document. Kent Morgan said it is strictly an advisory. Randy Hoskins mentioned that he thought on Page 93 under the *Pedestrian Facilities Plan* - we should keep the wording the same as other places in the document which say *Pedestrian Activities Centers Plan*. On Page 94, *develop a city-wide database deficient pedestrian facilities...* Need to develop both efficient and deficient data bases.

This section was unanimously accepted with the changes that the standards need to be developed to define the pedestrian level of service concept ; 2) change the wording to *Pedestrian Activities Centers Plan* in all areas of this section; and 3) develop a database for the system that includes all pedestrian facilities.

Bicycles and Trails on page F95 through F97. Roger referenced the strategies in the downtown. In the first bullet, it says we are interested in creating a downtown bicycles facilities plan. In the last bullet, it is calling for at least one north-south and one east-west corridor to pilot a dedicated painted bike lane and have installed within one year of Plan approval. Roger feels there are a huge number of external factors and components that this commitment doesn't take into account. Loss of parking, loss of thru lane and vehicular capacity. Roger certainly supports the concept but he is in opposition of this committee recommending that Public Works will dedicate a lane and have it installed all in one year. Much discussion was held on what the appropriate action for this strategy should be. The following points were brought up in the discussion: 1) This is too specific for the plan; 2) what happens if we don't get it accomplished?; and 3) if you are in noncompliance with the plan, the entire plan is in jeopardy. Kent Morgan said the committee felt very strongly about the year plan. They felt that if they didn't put a time frame in, it would probably never get accomplished. The revised language for the first bullet would be amended to read *Develop and implement a Downtown Bicycles Facilities Plan. This plan shall include north-south and east-west bicycle facilities to*

be implemented early in the planning stages. The last bullet should be amended to read *Identify at least one north-south and one east-west corridor to pilot a dedicated painted bike lane.*

This section was unanimously approved with the above revised language.

Public Transportation on Page F98 to F100.

Larry Worth suggested that a statement be added in the introductory portion of this section that would say *that public transportation should be an integral part with the transportation network.*

This section was unanimously approved with the above revised language.

Parking in the Downtown Area on Page F101 was unanimously approved with no comments or recommendations.

Future Street and Road Network on Page F102 through F103.

The recommendation text changes on roadway function classification definitions are to have one category which includes Interstate Freeway, Expressway and Principal Arterial. Two subcategories are to include; 1) Interstate, Freeway and Expressway and 2) Other Principal Arterial.

This section was approved unanimously with the above revised language.

Urban Street System on page F104 through F112.

Ron Schlautman had a comment on Page F108 where it shows Committed City Projects and proposed City Projects. He thought it should say City/State Projects and Committed Projects and Proposed Projects. It was decided that it should say *Committed Projects and Proposed Projects* and leave out the word *City*. Ron also mentioned that the last project on page F109, *US-77 and Pioneers Blvd. Interchange* should be an *interchange/study*.

Steve Burnham mentioned that on Page F105, the second item *US 34, East, 84th Street to County line* should be change to *US 34, East 84th Street, east to County line*.

Ron Schlautman wanted to go on record as saying on the Highway 2 widening, when the State relinquishes the State is obligated to bring things up to par but it doesn't necessarily mean widening to six lanes.

This section with above modifications was accepted unanimously.

County Rural Road System on Pages F112 through F114 was unanimously approved with no comments or recommendations.

Financial Analysis on Pages F114 through F115

Several questions were brought up regarding the funding for the Antelope Valley Project. Roger Figard will get clarification to Liz Wunderlick on those issues.

This section was approved unanimously.

Intelligent Transportation Systems on Pages F115 through F117

Discussion was held on whether to add a bullet for functional areas to identify *Parking Location Availability*. Upon further review it was determined that parking location availability is included within another functional area category and therefore is already identified in the plan.

Systems Management Strategy on Pages F117 through F121 was unanimously approved with no comments or recommendations.

Railroads on Page F121 was unanimously approved with no comments or recommendations.

Airports and Airfield on Pages F121 through F122 was unanimously approved with no comments or recommendations.

Goods & Freight on Pages F122 through F124 was unanimously approved with no comments or recommendations.

A motion was made to recommend acceptance of this document with the modifications that have been discussed here today to the Planning Commission. Motion carried unanimously.

Item No. 3 - A request from Lower Platte South Natural Resources District to amend the TIP to include the Lincoln Saline Wetland Bridge.

Roger Figard made a motion to amend the TIP to include Lincoln Saline Wetland Bridge project, seconded by Wullschleger. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.